

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 FREDERICK H. SHULL, JR.,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 ROSEMAN UNIVERSITY, et al.,

11 Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-02352-RFB-NJK

ORDER

12
13 Before the Court is the Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration [ECF No. 29]. The Court
14 does not find a basis for reconsidering its order on remand. While Defendant points to motions
15 that Plaintiff has filed regarding his alleged requests from the Court, the Court relied upon and
16 continues to rely upon his Amended Complaint as the operative and controlling document as to
17 his claims and requested relief. In his Amended Complaint, Plaintiff does not present a claim over
18 which this Court would have jurisdiction.

19 For the reasons stated above,

20 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Motion for Reconsideration [ECF No. 29] is
21 DENIED.

22
23 DATED: September 28, 2019.

24 

25 **RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II**
26 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
27
28